



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/905,036	07/12/2001	Jonathan J. Hull	015358-006000US	2402

20350 7590 03/11/2004

TOWNSEND AND TOWNSEND AND CREW, LLP
TWO EMBARCADERO CENTER
EIGHTH FLOOR
SAN FRANCISCO, CA 94111-3834

EXAMINER

CHEN, CHONGSHAN

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2172

13

DATE MAILED: 03/11/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/905,036

Applicant(s)

HULL ET AL.

Examiner

Chongshan Chen

Art Unit

2172

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on ____.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) ____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-44 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) ____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) ____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on ____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. ____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____. |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>5.10.11.12</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____. |

DETAILED ACTION

1. Claims 1-44 are pending in this Office Action.

Information Disclosure Statement

2. The references cited in the IDS, PTO-1449, Paper No. 5 and 10-12, have been considered.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

4. Claims 1-44 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Cooper et al. ("Cooper", 6,101,503).

As per claim 1, Cooper teaches a method of providing information to a user based upon contents of a first document displayed to the user, the method comprising:

identifying the first document displayed to the user (Cooper, col. 4, lines 13-20);

identifying at least a first section of the first document (Cooper, col. 3, lines 12-26, col. 4, lines 13-28);

extracting a first set of information objects from the first section of the first document (Cooper, Fig. 2 & 4, col. 3, lines 17-18).

Cooper further teaches using the first set of information objects from the first document to retrieve documents which are related to the first document (Cooper, Fig. 4, element 430, 450). Cooper does not explicitly disclose determining a degree of relevancy between the first document and its related document. However, the search system of Cooper has ranking capability (Cooper, col. 4, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rank function to determine a degree of relevance between the first document and its related documents in order to rank the documents according to their relevancy and display the most relevant documents to the user. This will save user reviewing time.

As per claim 2, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches the first section of the first document corresponds to a section of the first document displayed to the user (Cooper, col. 3, line 12 – col. 4. line 60).

As per claim 3, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches the first section of the first document corresponds to the entire first document (Cooper, col. 3, line 12 – col. 4. line 60).

As per claim 4, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches extracting the first set of information objects from the first section of the first document comprises: for each information object in the first set of information objects: identifying a type of the information object based upon contents of the information object; determining a first content recognition technique based upon the type of the information object (Cooper, col. 4, lines 30-40); and applying the first content recognition technique to the

Art Unit: 2172

information object to determine information related to the contents of the information object (Cooper, col. 3, lines 12-26).

As per claim 5, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches determining the degree of relevancy information for the second set of information objects comprises:

identifying a plurality of selection techniques for determining the degree of relevancy information (Cooper, col. 4, lines 15-18); and

for each selection technique in the plurality of selection techniques, applying the selection technique to generate relevancy scores for information objects in the second set of information objects, the relevancy scores indicating the relevancy of information objects in the second set of information objects to information objects in the first set of information objects calculated using the selection technique (Cooper, Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 13-40); and

selecting the third set of information objects comprises:

selecting information objects from the second set of information objects to be included in the third set of information objects based upon the relevancy scores for information objects in the second set of information objects calculated using the plurality of selection techniques (Cooper, Fig. 4, col. 4, lines 13-40).

As per claim 6, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, except for explicitly disclosing calculating an aggregate relevancy score for the information object by aggregating the relevancy scores generated for the information object by applying the plurality of selection techniques; and selecting the information object to be included in the third set of information objects if the aggregated relevancy score calculated for the information object

Art Unit: 2172

is above a threshold value. However, the search system of Cooper has ranking capability (Cooper, col. 4, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rank function to calculate a relevancy score in order to rank the documents according to their relevancy and display the most relevant documents to the user. This will save user reviewing time.

As per claim 7, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches identifying a first selection technique and a second selection technique for determining the degree of relevancy information (Cooper, Fig. 2-4, col. 4, lines 13-40). Cooper does not explicitly disclose generating relevancy scores. However, the search system of Cooper has ranking capability (Cooper, col. 4, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rank function to calculate a relevancy score in order to rank the documents according to their relevancy and display the most relevant documents to the user. This will save user reviewing time.

As per claim 8, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches determining a plurality of concepts of interest to the user (Cooper, col. 3, lines 12-26);

determining relevancy of each information object in the first set of information objects to each concept in the plurality of concepts (Cooper, Fig. 2-4, col. 4, lines 13-20);

determining relevancy of each information object in the second set of information objects to each concept in the plurality of concepts (Cooper, Fig. 2-4, col. 4, lines 13-20).

Cooper does not explicitly disclose calculating relevancy scores. However, the search system of Cooper has ranking capability (Cooper, col. 4, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have

Air Unit: 2172

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rank function to calculate a relevancy score in order to rank the documents according to their relevancy and display the most relevant documents to the user. This will save user reviewing time.

As per claim 9, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches identifying a type of the information object based upon contents of the information object (Cooper, Fig. 2-4, col. 4, lines 21-40); determining a comparison technique based upon the type of the information object (Cooper, Fig. 2-4, col. 3, lines 12-26).

Cooper does not explicitly disclose generating relevancy scores. However, the search system of Cooper has ranking capability (Cooper, col. 4, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rank function to calculate a relevancy score in order to rank the documents according to their relevancy and display the most relevant documents to the user. This will save user reviewing time.

As per claim 10, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches communicating the third set of information objects to a user system which is used to output information stored by information objects in the third set of information objects to the user (Cooper, Fig. 1-4).

As per claim 11, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches the first document is displayed to the user using an access program and the information stored by information objects in the third set of information objects is output to the user in a predetermined area of the access program (Cooper, Fig. 1-4).

Art Unit: 2172

As per claim 12, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 1, and further teaches the access program is a web browser and the first document is a web page (Cooper, col. 3, lines 50-62).

Claim 13 is rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 1.

As per claim 14, Cooper teaches a method of providing information to a user based upon contents of a document displayed to the user, the method comprising:

accessing a first set of content provider information objects (CPIOs) (Cooper, Fig. 2-4, col. 3, line 12 – col. 4, line 40);

identifying the document displayed to the user (Cooper, col. 4, lines 13-20);

extracting a first set of user document information objects (UDIOs) from the document (Cooper, Fig. 2-4, col. 4, lines 21-40).

Cooper further teaches using the extracted information objects to retrieve related documents (Cooper, Fig. 4, element 430, 450). Cooper does not explicitly disclose generating degree of relevancy information. However, the search system of Cooper has ranking capability (Cooper, col. 4, lines 15-17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the rank function to generate a degree of relevance in order to rank the documents according to their relevancy and display the most relevant documents to the user. This will save user reviewing time.

Claims 15-27 and 29-41 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claims 1-13.

Claims 28 and 42 are rejected on grounds corresponding to the reasons given above for claim 14.

Art Unit: 2172

As per claim 43, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 42, and further teaches at least one CPIO included in the first set of CPIOs is provided by a content provider system coupled to the server system (Cooper, Fig. 1).

As per claim 44, Cooper teaches all the claimed subject matters as discussed in claim 42, and further teaches the first set of CPIOs comprises a first CPIO and a second CPIO, wherein the first CPIO is provided by a first content provider system coupled to the server system and the second CPIO is provided by a second content provider system coupled to the server system (Cooper, Fig. 1).

Contact Information


Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chongshan Chen whose telephone number is 703-305-8319. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday (8:00 am - 4:30 pm).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E Breene can be reached on (703)305-9790. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2172

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

March 5, 2004


SHAHID ALAM
PRIMARY EXAMINER